

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The Specification is objected to for lack of headings for each section of the disclosure. Applicants will submit a corrected Specification upon indication of allowability.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10, and 20 are objected to for several informalities. Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended the claim accordingly.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,044,485 to Dent et al. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dent et al. (The Examiner's attention is drawn to the fact that claim 15 was not rejected in the Office Action. Applicants submit that Examiner probably meant to reject claim 15 under 35 USC 103 instead of claim 18 and will proceed accordingly.)

Independent claims 1 and 14, as amended, recite "wherein said first decoding method is RTZ and the second decoding method is Miller"; independent claim 10, as amended, recites "wherein said first encoding method is RTZ and said second encoding method is Miller". Dent et al. disclose a switching mechanism between two different error detection/correction codes. For example, in column 4, lines 5-20, Dent et al. describe using two different types of Forward Error Correction (FEC) codes to add redundant information to a Cycle Redundancy Checking (CRC) coded information signal and to decode CRC coded information signals. In contrast, independent claims 1, 10 and 14 disclose two different types of encoding or decoding of the datastream while Dent et al. disclose adding data to the datastream during the encoding/decoding steps.

Claim 14 further recites "a decision stage included in said decoding device". In contrast, Dent et al. do not disclose a decision stage located in the decoding device as claimed, but rather the CRC Decoder Circuit 214 (see column 5, lines 1-19) begins processing the encoded data

arbitrarily and then corrects by means of a feedback signal if an error is found. This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record.

Independent claims 21 and 23 recite "the first decoding stage being arranged to decode said data signal in conformity with a first decoding method while simultaneously the second decoding stage is arranged to decode said data signal in conformity with a second decoding method"; independent claim 22 recites "the first decoding stage being arranged to decode said data signal in conformity with a first decoding method while in parallel the second decoding stage is arranged to decode said data signal in conformity with a second decoding method". Dent et al. disclose in Figure 2 that a receiver 200 has a first receiver switch 206 and a second receiver switch 212 to use a correction code decoded by the first decoder circuit 208 or the second decoder circuit 210. In case the selected decoder circuit (208 or 210) does not fit the encoding method used by the transmitter the CRC decoder circuit 214 changes the switches 206 and 212. Therefore, if the correct decoder (208 or 210) is not chosen from the start, transmitted data may be lost. In contrast, independent claims 21 and 23 recite simultaneously decoding the signal with both the first and second decoding methods; independent claim 22 discloses decoding the signal with first and second decoding methods in parallel.

Claim 24 recites "wherein once the decision stage applies decision information to the data processing device regarding which of the first and second decoding stages is suitable to decode the encoded data signal, the selected first or second decoding stage is used for processing the remainder of the encoded data signal". In contrast, Dent et al. disclose a system which is designed to dynamically change decoding methods upon determination that an error has taken place.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 13-14, and 16-25 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees which may be required, except the issue fee, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 16, 2004

By


Christopher F. Morgan

Reg. No. 40,394

Tel. No. 408-474-9072

Correspondence Address:

Philips Electronics North America Corporation
1000 West Maude Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94085